

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Applicants: David Edward Evans
Assignee: International Business Machines Corporation
Title: Graphical User Interface Operations
Serial No.: 10/561,686 Filing Date: 12/02/2003
Examiner: Ernest Unelus Group Art Unit: 2181
Docket No.: GB920030049US1 Customer No.: 61136

April 7, 2010

Filed Electronically

**PRE-APPEAL BRIEF REQUEST FOR REVIEW
AND STATEMENT OF REASONS**

Sir:

Applicant requests review of the Final Office Action in this application. No amendments are being filed with the request. This request is being filed with a Notice of Appeal. The following sets forth a succinct, concise, and focused set of arguments for which the review is being requested.

CLAIM STATUS

Claims 1-6 and 8-12 are pending in the application. Claims 1-6 and 8-12 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e), as anticipated by Son, U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0046281 (Son).

REMARKS

Son discloses an information search system that enables collection of information and support of formation of groups which people who share a same interest can join. This system includes an intermediate server and a central server, where the intermediate server retains indexes for searching the content database on the central server. Users issue a search request to the intermediate server and search results are returned and recorded on the intermediate server as a search history. The search history is shared by users and used as references from which retrievable content can be selected.

When setting forth that Son discloses predicting a next user input to the GUI, the examiner cites to the following portion of Son:

A user must first register with any intermediate server. The control unit 32 uses user registration data to authenticate a user. Using a user registration window of graphical user interface (GUI), a user enters his or her nickname (user ID) and password and chooses whether to have search history recorded by default or whether to make search history open by default. The control unit 32 stores the input user information on the storage 33. (Son, ¶ 0051.)

However, nowhere within this portion of Son (or anywhere else in Son) is there a disclosure or suggestion of *predicting* a next user input to the GUI, as required by claim 1 and as substantially required by claims 6 and 8.

Additionally, when setting forth that Son discloses determining whether the predicted user input corresponds to the actual next user input and, on a positive determination, processing an activation portion of said GUI code to complete the required GUI function, the examiner cites to a portion of Son which discusses user authenticating arrangements. (See e.g., Son ¶ 0116.) However, nowhere within this portion of Son (or anywhere else in Son) is there a disclosure or suggestion of *predicting* a next user input, much less determining whether *the predicted user input* corresponds to *an actual next user input*, much less on *a positive determination* (of whether the predicted user input corresponds to the actual user input) processing *an activation portion* of said GUI code to complete the required GUI function, as required by claim 1 and as substantially required by claims 6 and 8.

Accordingly, claims 1 and 8 are allowable over Son. Claims 2 – 5 depend from claim 1 and are allowable for at least this reason. Claims 9 – 12 depend from claim 8 and are allowable for at least this reason.

Additionally, when setting forth that Son discloses a prediction step which includes predicting a potential sequence of user inputs and an execution step which includes executing a preparation portion of GUI code for each of the user inputs of the predicted sequence, the examiner cites to a portion of Son which discusses user authenticating arrangements. (See e.g., Son ¶ 0116.) However, nowhere within this portion of Son (or anywhere else in Son) is there a disclosure or suggestion of predicting *a potential sequence of user inputs*, much less executing a

preparation portion of GUI code for each of the user inputs of the predicted sequence, as required by claim 4 and as substantially required by claim 11. Accordingly, for at least this additional reason, claims 4 and 11 are allowable over Son.

Additionally, when setting forth that Son discloses a prediction step which includes predicting a plurality of alternative potential user inputs and an execution step which includes executing a preparation portion of GUI code for each of the alternative user inputs, the examiner cites to a portion of Son which discusses user authenticating arrangements. (See e.g., Son ¶ 0116.) However, nowhere within this portion of Son (or anywhere else in Son) is there a disclosure or suggestion of *predicting a plurality of alternative potential user inputs*, much less *executing a preparation portion of GUI code for each of the alternative user inputs*, as required by claim 5 and as substantially required by claim 12. Accordingly, for at least this additional reason, claims 5 and 12 are allowable over Son.

CONCLUSION

In view of the amendments and remarks set forth herein, the application is believed to be in condition for allowance and a notice to that effect is solicited. Nonetheless, should any issues remain that might be subject to resolution through a telephonic interview, the examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned at 512-338-9100.

CERTIFICATE OF TRANSMISSION

I hereby certify that on April 7, 2010, this correspondence is being transmitted via the U.S. Patent & Trademark Office's electronic filing system.

/Stephen A. Terrile/

Respectfully submitted,

/Stephen A. Terrile/

Stephen A. Terrile
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Reg. No. 32,946